Question & Answer

Question 1: Will you accept unclassified abstracts? (Assuming we can sufficiently explain our key innovations and relevance to Manta Ray)

Answer 1: Yes, but note that unclassified abstracts will not be able to address all aspects of the BAA. Additionally, please refer to page 3 of the Manta Ray Broad Agency Announcement, "Key aspects of the Manta Ray program are classified. Only proposals addressing the classified aspects of Manta Ray will be eligible for funding under this BAA. DARPA seeks proposals that present a credible path to a rapid demonstration of program objectives."

Question 2: Does the payload require a certain orientation at different stages of the mission?

Answer 2: DARPA expects proposers to provide this requirement based on their design. Please refer to Section I.B.1.a of the BAA regarding Technical Area 1 requirements.

Question 3: Can you provide a value for the Phase 1 total program funding (without option)?

Answer 3: There is no prescribed value of Phase 1. Proposers should provide justification for their proposed costs to meet the Phase 1 objectives, as outlined in the BAA. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the stated criteria.

Question 4: What is the maximum time allowed for the initial transit?

Answer 4: There are no time requirements established in the BAA for the initial transit, as it is dependent upon the launch location and objective location. Per Part II Section I.B.1 of the BAA, “Successful proposals will address the full set of capability metrics required to complete the mission vignette defined in the classified addendum.”

Question 5: The BAA states: (ROM) cost estimates only and an associated list of assumptions for anticipated follow-on Phases 2 and 3 (this will be for planning purposes only and will not be evaluated as part of the selection decision). Does this mean that the technical elements associated with Phases 2 & 3 will also not be evaluated?

Answer 5: No. The technical elements for all Phases (1, 2, and 3) contribute to your overall plan to achieve program objectives. All technical elements will be evaluated per Part II Section V.A of the BAA.

Question 6: Only Phase 2 & 3 specify Level 4 WBS (pages 9-10). Is that referring to the follow-on proposals for Phase 2 & 3 or to be included in this proposal? What WBS level is requested for Phase 1?

Answer 6: While not required for Phase 1, Level 4 WBS provides the greatest level of detail and understanding for DARPA to review the planned approach and schedule realism per the evaluation criteria in Part II Section V.A.1 of the BAA. Level 4 WBS for Phases 2 and 3 is required per Part II Section 2.B.2 of the BAA in this proposal.

Question 7: Does the Systems Engineering Management Plan need to be included in our proposal or be develop during Phase 1 as deliverable or both?

Answer 7: Proposals should discuss the systems engineering approach, but the plan is not required in the proposal. Please refer to BAA page 13 for detailed requirements of the systems engineering management plan deliverable. Part II, Section I.B.3., Table 3 Item #1 of the BAA.
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states that the Systems Engineering Management Plan is due “within 90 days of contract award” with updates as stated.

Question 8: Cost metrics are discussed on page 14, please clarify/provide the metric (i.e. number).

Answer 8: Proposers should provide proposed cost metrics and sufficient detail of initial cost estimates to support the proposer’s cost metrics as applicable to their proposed technical approach.

Question 9: Is it permissible to use a PL2 shared system for proposal writing and program execution?

Answer 9: PL2 shared systems will be considered on a case by case basis, to ensure that the program information is properly safeguarded. Send an e-mail to HR001119S0040@darpa.mil with the specifics of your request and the Program Security Representative and Program Security Officer will provide specific guidance.

Question 10: Is the project open only for classified technologies?

Answer 10: Please refer to page 3 of the Manta Ray Broad Agency Announcement, "Key aspects of the Manta Ray program are classified. Only proposals addressing the classified aspects of Manta Ray will be eligible for funding under this BAA. DARPA seeks proposals that present a credible path to a rapid demonstration of program objectives."

Question 11: The Manta Ray vehicle requirements are stated to have a “minimum surface expression”, please define how frequent a surface expression would be preferrable/acceptable. How close to an operating area will a surface expression be preferred/ permissible?

Answer 11: Proposers should provide their anticipated approach to meeting the BAA objectives, including those offered in the classified addendum. If there are key risks associated with the proposed approach they should be detailed and mitigation strategies should be discussed.

Question 12: Due to the timing of when our team became aware of the BAA solicitation, our team was not able to review the classified addendum material ahead of the question submission deadline. Will there be an opportunity to ask questions pertaining to the classified addendum after the 18 JUNE 2019 question deadline?

Answer 12: Per BAA Part I: Overview Information, the questions due date has passed. However, if DARPA deems necessary additional answers may be posted to clarify the BAA.

Question 13: Deliverable Item #7 lists Design Drawings in CAD format. Is a specific CAD file type preferred?

Answer 13: There is no specific format required per the BAA, however DARPA requests CAD files to be able to be opened and read via industry standard commercially available software.

Question 14: The expressed interest in “leveraging existing maritime data sets” to improve Nav & C3 performance is noted. Will government-owned data sets be made available to awardees as GFI to support system development & training?
**Answer 14:** DARPA does not intend to provide specific government furnished materials to all performers. If proposers request specific government furnished information to support their proposed solution, follow the requirements stated in Part II Section IV.B.2.a.J of the BAA on page 28.

**Question 15:** Deliverable Item #7 includes ICD’s at SRR/CoDR, but this documentation for an integrated system will likely be premature at this milestone. Will high-level ICD outlines with little detail be acceptable at SRR/CoDR?

**Answer 15:** Deliverables listed in Part II, Section I.B.3., Table 3 Item #7 of the BAA are anticipated to have increasing level of detail on each review commensurate with the technical development of the program. The SRR/CoDR deliverables should be consistent with the level of detail to fulfill the description of “SRR and CoDR” requirements on page 14 of the BAA.

**Question 16:** Deliverable Item #15 lists delivery of a 6 DoF simulation data every 6 months. Does a Matlab/Simulink – based simulation model satisfy this deliverable requirement?

**Answer 16:** Deliverables listed in Part II, Section I.B.3., Table 3 Item #15 of the BAA should fulfill the stated language of the BAA: “All models, databases, and algorithms (algorithmic descriptions and software implementations) required to implement a fully representative 6 Degree of Freedom simulation of the performer’s system design.” The BAA does not specify a specific software type required to be used to fulfill this requirement. Proposers should provide sufficient detail for their approach in their technical volume.

**Question 17:** For clarification, are the SRR & CoDR anticipated to be joint/concurrent review events?

**Answer 17:** The BAA specifies that the SRR, CoDR, and PDR should be completed in the initial 11 month period of Phase 1. Proposers are expected to propose and execute a technically realistic schedule that allows DARPA to review the planned approach per the evaluation criteria Part II Section V.A.1 of the BAA.

**Question 18:** WRT Non-U.S. Organizations, our system design currently uses a generator supplied as COTS from a non-US Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) due to the lack of quality alternatives within the U.S. This OEM is not aware of the details of the application and information exchange is limited to basic interface requirements (e.g. cooling loads, mounting, etc.) and pricing. Does this approach generally comply with the ITAR restrictions and expectations discussed in para III.A.2?

**Answer 18:** Part II Section III.A.2 of the BAA discusses the ability “to participate in this effort.” ITAR compliance is governed by the Department of State. Details of ITAR compliance may be found on the Department of State website at: https://www.pmddtc.state.gov/ddtc_public?id=ddtc_kb_article_page&sys_id=4f06583fdb78d300d0a370131f961913

**Question 19:** Para C indicates an intention for the performer to team “with Phase 1 and 2” performers. Does this imply that DARPA may request consolidation of subsystems (from different development efforts) into a joint integrated platform for the Phase 3 effort?

**Answer 19:** This BAA solicits integrated solutions that span the entirety of Phases 1, 2, and 3. Part II Section I.B.2 of the BAA on page 8 states “Toward the end of Phase 1, DARPA may
issue additional guidance to ask Phase 1 performers whose Phase 1 option periods were exercised to provide full proposals to compete for Phase 2 and 3 awards.”

Question 20: Should a short proposed position description for each resume submitted be included in the 2 page resume format?

Answer 20: Part II Section IV.B.2.a.C of the BAA states “Identify key personnel by name and include a description of their role.” Resumes should meet the requirements of Part II Section IV.B.2.a.F of the BAA to include key personnel for evaluation of Part II Section V.A.4 of the BAA.

Question 21: The requirement for the Program Security Lead and Information Assurance Officer to be bid as key personnel is understood. Is there additional specific position requirements (e.g. minimum certifications) that are expected, or other position description guidance that could be provided?

Answer 21: DARPA has no additional specific key personnel requirements other than those listed in the BAA. However, proposers should provide sufficient key personnel such that evaluators are able to evaluate if key personnel have substantial related experience in the assigned areas of responsibility. Refer to Part II Section V.A.4 of the BAA: “…The proposer identifies key personnel and substantially commits them to this effort. The proposed personnel have substantial related experience in the assigned area of responsibility. The proposed team is highly cohesive and utilization of personnel dedicated to rapidly advancing the technical capability is maximized.”